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Comments to the Author

The manuscript addresses an interesting field of research. It is important to have effective and research based intervention programs about primary and secondary caries prevention. However I have some major concerns about this manuscript.

• The information of the subjects were insufficient to prove the effectiveness of the caries prevention. There was no subjects' information regarding the use of water fluoridation and socio-economic status although socio-economic status was described in limitation. The information would have been one of the most important confounding factors in the present study. In addition, there was no information that when and where the survey was conducted, and that how many schools participated.

• There was no information that how subjects were divided to the experimental group or the control group. Selection bias might have occurred in the present study.

• TOCE is not common to evaluate the status of dental caries. DMFT or dmft were usually used in epidemiological study for caries prevention. You need to explain why TOCE was used.

• The statistical results were mainly described in discussion and the epidemiological discussion was not enough. This may result from the shortage of the subjects' information.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
No
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
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If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
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I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.
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